| ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME 7/12/65 | DATE RECEIVED |
|---|---|---|---|

A. PUBLICATION DATA

| 1. ERIC NUMBER: ED000302 | 2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).: 7034 | 3. IDENTIFICATION NO.: N.A. | DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW |
|---|---|---|---|

4. AUTHOR(S): Edson, Wm. H. and Davies, Don

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Selective Admission and Retention Practices in the Teacher Education Institutions of Minnesota

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN: ORG. Univ. of Minn. Minneapolis, Minn. ST. CITY, STATE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: University of Minnesota

TELE. EXT. INST/LOC CODE

| 10. VOL. | 11. PAGES | 12. MO./YR. | 13. TOTAL PP. |
|---|---|---|---|
| N.A. | N.A. | 5? | 25 |

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE: YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED: YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED: YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT: PROPOSAL ☐ IN-PROGRESS ☐ FINAL ☒ FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: surveys

16. INDEXING TERMS (8-12)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| surveys Y-18A | teacher edu. Y-20 | | | |
| admissions R-07 | follow-up studies G-33 | | | |
| retention P-41 | professional edu. P-20 | | | |

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

Report based on two questionnaire studies: "A Study of Admissions and Retention Practices in College and University Programs of Teacher Education," 1953; and a 1958 followup of the 1953 study. Gives comparisons of 1953 and 1958 opinions and practices relating to selective admission and retention in 19 accredited teacher education institutions in Minnesota. Includes recommendations for improving procedures in Minnesota.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.

21. CONTRACT NO.

PROJECT NO.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

23. DURATION OF PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

IV-21

This is last available copy for distribution

# SELECTIVE ADMISSION AND RETENTION PRACTICES IN THE TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS OF MINNESOTA

William H. Edson and
Don Davies,

College of Education
University of Minnesota

STUDENT TEACHING OFFICE
227 Burton Hall
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MINNEAPOLIS 14, MINNESOTA

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Sponsored by:

State Advisory Committee on Teacher Education

Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Minnesota Education Association

Based on studies conducted by:

Ruth A. Stout 1953

James B. Preus
Elinore M. Fram
William H. Edson
Don Davies 1958

January, 1959

7/8

IV-20

ED000302

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


PREFACE

PART I - INTRODUCTION 1-2

PART II - PRACTICES IN 1953 AND 1958: A GENERAL COMPARISON 3-4

PART III - OPINION AND PRACTICE - SELECTED ITEMS 5-14

PART IV - PROPOSED NEXT STEPS 14-15

PART V - ANNOTATED REFERENCES 16-22


## TABLES


| Number | Title | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I | Minnesota Institutions Participating in Both the 1953 and 1958 Studies | 1 |
| II | Effect of Higher Admission Standards on Number of Students | 5 |
| III | Effect of Higher Admission Standards on Quality of Students | 6 |
| IV | Recommended Direction of Changes to be Made in Admission Standards | 6 |
| V | Changes in Selective Admission and Retention That Should be Made Immediately | 7 |
| VI | Five Most Important Criteria for Selective Admission and Retention in Programs of Teacher Education | 8 |
| VII | Use of Cutting Scores on Admission Tests | 9 |
| VIII | Academic Achievement Required for Admission to the Teacher Education Program | 9 |
| IX | Points at Which Personality Instruments are Used | 10 |
| X | Points at Which Faculty Committees are Used | 11 |
| XI | Personnel Serving on Selection Committees | 11 |
| XII | Points at Which the Interview is Used | 12 |
| XIII | Colleges Reporting Use of Interview for Case Review | 12 |
| XIV | Personnel Interviewing Applicants to Teacher Education | 13 |

# PREFACE

This report is written primarily for the participants in the Workshop on Selective Admission and Retention Practices in Teacher Education, January 30-31, 1959, at the College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, Minnesota. The report is designed to further the purposes of the Workshop. Among these are the following:

1) To increase recognition of the need for selectivity in teacher education

2) To examine critically present beliefs and practices relating to selectivity

3) To encourage modification and improvement of practices in each institution in Minnesota which prepares teachers

The validity of these purposes rest on two assumptions: (1) that the teaching profession has both the right and the responsibility to be selective in choosing and endorsing candidates for teaching and (2) that high standards of selectivity will result in both a larger number and a higher quality of young people completing teacher education programs and entering teaching.

The material herein is based on two studies. The first was conducted by Ruth Stout in 1953.[1] The second was a follow-up of the Stout study in 1958 by Elinore Milstein Fram and James B. Preus.[2] William H. Edson and Don Davies directed and coordinated the latter undertaking. This report is derived from the analyses in these two studies, but it is not a detailed summary of either. It is limited to some general statements and specific items that the writers feel will be of special interest as basis for discussion during the Workshop.

Both the Workshop and the 1958 follow-up study were sponsored jointly by the State Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and the Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the Minnesota Education Association. The latter group provided most of the financial support needed to conduct the follow-up study and to produce this report.

Special acknowledgement should go to F. E. Heinemann, Secretary, State Advisory Committee on Teacher Education; Glaydon Robbins, Chairman, Minnesota TEPS Commission; and A. L. Gallup, Executive Secretary, Minnesota Education Association.

---

[1] Stout, Ruth A. "A Study of Admissions and Retention Practices in College and University Programs of Teacher Education." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1957.

[2] Fram, Elinore and Preus, James B. "Selective Admission and Retention Practices in the Teacher Education Institutions of Minnesota." Unplublished Starred Paper, University of Minnesota, 1958.

# PART I

## INTRODUCTION

### Background

In 1953 Stout undertook a nation-wide study of admission and retention practices in teacher education. Her purposes were 1) to describe current beliefs and practices; 2) to determine similarities and differences among institutions grouped according to location, adminstrative control, and size; and 3) to determine whether there is a relationship between selective admission and retention practices and the output of teachers. Data were gathered by means of a 32 page, two-part questionnaire which was mailed to all of the 865 accredited teacher-preparing institutions in the United States. Of these, 785 colleges ( 91 percent) returned both parts of the questionnaire. These comprised the population of the study. Of the 785 participants, 19 were Minnesota colleges and universities.

### Procedures Used in the 1958 Follow-up Study

In May, 1958, the questionnaire developed by Stout was mailed to presidents of each of the 22 accredited teacher education institutions in Minnesota.[3] Completed questionnaires were returned by all of these institutions. However, in the analysis of data in the follow-up study, and in this report, only those returns from the 19 institutions fully-represented in both the 1953 and 1958 studies were included. Table I lists the participating institutions.

TABLE I

Minnesota Institutions Participating in Both the 1953 and 1958 Studies

Bemidji State College, Bemidji
Concordia College, Moorhead
Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter
Hamline University, St. Paul
Macalester College, St. Paul
Mankato State College, Mankato
Moorhead State College, Moorhead
College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph
College of St. Catherine, St. Paul
St. John's University, Collegeville
St. Mary's University, Winona
St. Olaf College, Northfield
College of St. Scholastica, Duluth
College of St. Teresa, Winona
College of St. Thomas, St. Paul
University of Minnesota, Duluth
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
Winona State College, Winona

Note: Augsburg College, Minneapolis, and Bethel College, St. Paul, participated in 1958 study only. Carleton College, Northfield, returned only Part I of the 1953 study, but participated fully in 1958.

[3] MacPhail School of Music and the Minneapolis School of Music, both accredited by the State Department of Education for the preparation of music teachers, were not included in this group because of the specialized nature of their programs.

## Purposes of the Follow-up Study

The specific purposes of the 1958 study were as follows:

1) To determine and summarize stated beliefs and practices relating to selective admission and retention in accredited Minnesota colleges and universities

2) To compare beliefs and practices in 1953 with those in 1958 in order to identify changes and trends

## Limitations

The study is based upon responses to a questionnaire, a device recognized to have limitations. A cautious reader should take into account that variations in the interpretations of both questions and responses may have occurred. Further, there is no way to know to what extent certain beliefs are held in common by faculties of participating institutions. Some questions called for an opinion or an element of judgment, and in some cases the respondent in 1953 was not the same individual as the respondent in 1958.

The questionnaire responses permit a report of what one or more persons in each college state the beliefs and practices to be. It must be assumed that the president selected respondents who could best speak for the college.

An additional note of caution is needed. On the basis of expressions of opinion or reports of policy and practices within the various colleges in Minnesota, one cannot say that the students of one are more competent as students or more promising as teachers than those in another. The quality of the students in any college is dependent upon the group from which the selection is made and the kinds of selection decisions that are reached. The follow-up study did not attempt to compare the students; it dealt with policies, practices, and opinions. However, it may be said that unless a college collects pertinent information about students and has policies and procedures that enable it to use the information for selection, the quality of its students is at least in doubt.

## Organization of This Report

Part II, which follows, is a general comparison between practices in 1953 and 1958. Part III contains a summary of responses to specific items relating to opinion and practice. Part IV is devoted to proposals for research and action, and Part V is an annotated list of references, compiled by William H. Edson and Elinore M. Fram.

PART II

## PRACTICES IN 1953 AND 1958
## A GENERAL COMPARISON

Five years is a relatively short time in the evolution of educational programs so that little or no change might be anticipated. However, these years have been marked by public concern about the quality of our teachers, by foundation and government sponsored studies to encourage changes, and by professional journal articles dealing with selection. Granted then that time has been short, has widespread interest been reflected in changes that may be detected through a survey of the kind conducted?

### Are Minnesota Colleges More Selective Now?

The broadest general question might be answered first: Are Minnesota colleges more selective in their teacher education programs now than in 1953? Preus and Fram approached this broad question by making two separate analyses of the questionnaires. First, following the plan devised by Stout, they compared the 1953 and 1958 statements made by each college in response to questions about the use in regular and continuing selection of academic records and of evaluations of physical fitness, emotional stability, speech and voice, English proficiency, personal-social-ethical fitness, and other characteristics. They concluded, on the basis of this first kind of analysis, there are twelve schools which have become more selective and seven schools less selective. On these particular items there appears to be a high degree of inconsistency between the first and second report. They pointed out, however, that if one considers Minnesota colleges as a group from which the teacher supply is drawn, there is no significant difference in the frequency of use of the various evaluative practices between 1953 and 1958.

As indicated in the last paragraph, the questionnaire asked what information was used in selection, i.e., on what basis selection took place. Scattered through the questionnaire were other items asking what information the colleges collect and when they obtained it.

Fram and Preus made a second kind of analysis of the follow-up data, in which they determined what kinds of information about students are available and compared this with the kinds of information actually used in selection. They particularly looked for information collected about emotional stability, academic achievement, moral and ethical fitness, demonstrated ability to work with children, general intelligence, and physical fitness. They found a high positive relationship between data collected and data used in 1953 but a negative relationship between data collected and data used in 1958. The difference lies not in the claims made about the collection of information but in the claims made about its use. Schools tended to maintain their same relative position so far as the collection of information is concerned.

### Information-Gathering

One further general statement concerning changes in selectivity over this five-year period is justified. As one examines the amount of information and the breadth of information that schools are collecting about their students one finds that (1) the colleges are obtaining more information upon which selective admission and retention can be based and (2) they are obtaining this information in more

areas that are presumed to be related to the students' personal qualifications for teaching.

A major section of the questionnaire was devoted to opinions about selectivity. If actions are based upon beliefs, then it is appropriate to ask what changes have taken place in these beliefs in the past five years. In summary, one may say that whereas there were in 1953 two dissenters who thought there should not be selective admission, in 1958 all respondents replied in favor of programs for selective admission to teacher education.

Summarizing the report of practices as they have changed, one can say that while more tests are used and used at more times during the program, they still seem to be used chiefly for admission. The greatest increase has come in the use of achievement tests, but there has been some increase in the use of interest and personality inventories. There appears to be less emphasis on college aptitude tests. Although there has been some increase in the use of the interview prior to admission to student teaching, it remains chiefly a technique employed when a student is having difficulty. It is not widely used with all students for assessment, orientation, or counseling.

It is noteworthy that there has been some increase in the use of a faculty committee as a body responsible for the admission and periodic review of teacher education candidates. About one-half of the colleges have such committees today, whereas but one-third had them in 1953.

## Use of Trained Personnel Workers

Of particular significance may be the fact that schools report that they are using fewer trained personnel people in their programs of selective admission and retention. This at least suggests that programs are being carried on by people whose chief interest and assignment may not be in the area of personnel assessment and evaluation. If one assumes that a certain technical competence is required to interpret some kinds of personnel information and that information is most likely to be used by those who understand it, the fact that personnel people are less used in selection today may be related to the fact that colleges report collecting information but do not report using it.

A study of the percentages of applicants for teacher education who are not admitted or who are later discontinued may be indicative of the use of selective devices. Such percentages may be quite misleading if comparisons between schools are made because the overall quality of the applicants may vary, the amount of selection that may have taken place prior to application for teacher education may be quite different, and because there may be differences in defining what is an applicant. Nevertheless, it is still desirable to look at the percentages as one way of establishing whether selectivty is being practiced. Three schools report that upon application for admission to the teacher education program no one is refused. A fourth college reports that it does no screening for admission. At the other extreme, one school reports that as many as 30 per cent of its applicants are rejected. The mode appears to be between one and five per cent of the applicants for teacher education rejected. All schools report some screening subsequent to admission and prior to student teaching. The percentage dropped from the program varies from one to more than 30 percent. The majority indicate a drop-out of six to ten percent.

## PART III

## OPINION AND PRACTICES - SELECTED ITEMS

Part II emphasized generalizations drawn from the facts and figures. At this point the focus is changed to some of the specific responses that may be important in conference discussion.

In the opinionnaire section of the questionnaire, the first question asked was, "Do you think there should be selective admission to teacher education programs at the present time?" In 1953 there were seventeen "yes" responses and two "no" responses. In 1958 all nineteen respondents agreed that there should be selective admission.

### Effect of Selectivity on Quantity

The colleges then had an opportunity to indicate the likely result of raising standards of admission to teacher education. Table II shows that there has been a decided shift in the feeling about this matter in the last five years and that people may be more optimistic about the efficacy of selectivity as a recruitment device.

TABLE II

Effect of Higher Admission Standards on Number of Students

| Opinion expressed | 1953 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|
| No opinion | 4 | 1 |
| Increased number of applicants | 10 | 17 |
| Decreased number of applicants | 1 | 0 |
| No change in number of applicants | 4 | 1 |

### Effect of Selectivity on Quality

The next question dealt with the effect selective admission might have on the quality of the students in teacher education. At the time of the earlier report about one-fifth of the schools stated that raising standards would make little difference in the quality of the teachers prepared. By the time of the more recent survey all were agreed that raising standards would result in at least some upgrading, and the majority held that it would result in a significant increase in quality. Table III shows the change that has taken place.

TABLE III

Effect of Higher Admission Standards
on Quality of Students

| Opinion | 1953 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|
| No opinion | 1 | 0 |
| Significant gain in quality of teachers | 8 | 10 |
| Some upgrading; no striking change | 6 | 9 |
| Little shift | 4 | 0 |

Should Admission Standards be Raised?

In response to the question, "In general, what do you think should be done at present about standards for admission to teacher education?" twice as many schools in the second survey favored raising standards to attract more capable people as advanced this view in 1953. The number of respondents who felt that standards should be made more nearly comparable with other professions increased by one-third. There was a decrease from seven to four in the number who felt that our present knowledge of valid criteria was insufficient to justify change. (See Table IV)

TABLE IV

Recommended Direction of Changes to be Made
in Admission Standards

| Opinion | 1953 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|
| Lowered to meet shortage | 0 | 0 |
| Raised to attract more capable people | 6 | 12 |
| Made more like other professions | 6 | 8 |
| Not altered until criteria more valid | 7 | 4 |
| Other | 2 | 0 |

Next Steps

Table V summarizes the responses to the Question, "If you feel there should be selective admission and retention, what steps should be taken immediately?" An extension of recuitment and orientation fell somewhat in favor, but in 1958 there was at least as much, and perhaps more, interest in having evidence in addition to grade rank, better vocational guidance, periodic review with specific criteria, and

an increase in the number of people sharing in the decisions concerning admission and retention. Perhaps the most significant thing about responses to this question is that everyone, except a person who had no opinion, recommended some change; no one favored continuing practices as they now exist.

TABLE V

Changes in Selective Admission and Retention
That Should be Made Immediately

| Opinion | 1953 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|
| No opinion | 0 | 1 |
| No change wise at this time | 2 | 0 |
| Higher grade average | 4 | 8 |
| More objective measures of personality | 11 | 7 |
| Other evidence in addition to grade rank | 14 | 15 |
| Better vocational guidance of student | 13 | 15 |
| Extension of recruitment and orientation | 12 | 6 |
| Specific criteria for periodic review of students' progress | 11 | 12 |
| Greater number of people to pass on admission and retention | 8 | 11 |

What Criteria Should be Used?

Table VI is based upon the responses to the question, "What do you think are the five most important criteria in selective admission and retention programs for teacher education?" As in both the national and local surveys of 1953, the 1958 respondents most frequently favored emotional stability as one of the five. Academic achievement was slightly more favored in 1958 than previously. General intelligence and moral and ethical fitness continued to be ranked high with demonstrated ability to work with children coming along as the last of the five.

TABLE VI

Five Most Important Criteria For Selective Admission and Retention in Programs of Teacher Education

| Opinion | 1953 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|
| Emotional stability | 15 | 17 |
| Academic achievement | 13 | 15 |
| General intelligence | 13 | 14 |
| Moral-ethical fitness | 13 | 14 |
| Demonstrated ability to work with children | 12 | 13 |
| Professional interest and motivation | 10 | 9 |
| Physical fitness | 8 | 6 |
| Ratings and recommendations from former teachers | 3 | 2 |
| Demonstrated ability to work in community | 1 | 0 |

What are Current Practices?

Turning from the opinions expressed about what colleges should be doing one may study the reports of what they are doing. What are the practices in selection and retention in teacher education? What are the standards of the colleges?

In both 1953 and 1958 high school graduation was the minimum requirement for admission to a Minnesota institution. Note that this is the institution, not the teacher education program within the institution, that has such a requirement. One must look further to establish the requirements of the teacher education program, which may or may not be the same as for the total institution. Graduation in the top half of the high school class, i.e., high school rank, was the second most common requirement. In some schools high school rank was used in conjunction with an academic aptitude test.

Table VII reports responses to the question, "What cutting score on tests or batteries is used to admit students to your institution?"

TABLE VII

Use of Cutting Scores on Admission Tests

| | 1953 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|
| No cutting score enforced | 9 | 6 |
| Test used with high school rank | 5 | 7 |
| 35 P. R. or better on ACE | 6 | 5 |
| 50 P. R. or better on ACE | 0 | 2 |
| Passing College Board Examinations | 0 | 1 |

In most colleges the previous academic record is evaluated at admission, periodically, and at admission to teacher education. Of the eighteen colleges that offered other programs in 1953, three required grade point averages higher for students in teacher education than for others. Four of these eighteen colleges required higher grade point averages of those preparing to teach in 1958. These general statements are drawn from the responses to the question, "What does initial admission to the teacher-education program imply?" Responses are summarized in table VIII. Columns may not be totaled because multiple responses were possible.

TABLE VIII

Academic Achievement Required for Admission to the Teacher Education Program

| | 1953 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|
| No standard prescribed until application for student teaching | 12 | 12 |
| C average in all academic work | 15 | 13 |
| C average in education courses | 8 | 6 |
| C+ average in education courses | 3 | 4 |
| C average in the major | 6 | 5 |
| C+ average in the major | 3 | 5 |
| Probationary admission with later review | 4 | 3 |
| Other | 0 | 4 |

## Use of Personality Instruments

In 1953 and again in 1958 emotional stability was the characteristic thought to be the most important in the teacher candidate. Moral and ethical fitness were also considered to be of great importance. Are colleges selecting students for teacher preparation with these characteristics in mind? The questionnaire gets at this only in part. It does not ask any specific questions about the use of anecdotal records or other reports of behavior that a committee might use in its evaluation. It limits questions in the personality area to those dealing with use of tests and inventories. A report of selectivity in this area is then limited to the extent to which standardized inventories are employed for this purpose. Table IX summarizes responses to the question, "Which, if any, of the following instruments are used regularly for admission to the college, to the teacher education program, in periodic review, and admission to student teaching?"

### TABLE IX

Points at Which Personality Instruments are Used

| | | Number of Colleges Using: Bell | MMPI | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Admission to the college | 1953 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| | 1958 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Admission to teacher education | 1953 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| | 1958 | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| Periodic review | 1953 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| | 1958 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Admission to student teaching | 1953 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| | 1958 | 1 | 3 | 0 |

## Use of Personnel Data

The effectiveness of a program of selective admission and retention may be quite closely related to the manner in which the data about students are collected and used and to the positions held by the persons who use them. Stout reported in her study a list of practices which appear to characterize institutions with a consistently functioning selective admission and retention program. One of the practices she mentioned was a "review of each student's case at stated intervals, with interviews and faculty committee evaluations as elements in the review procedure." If we accept her statement, it is in order to ask to what extent is the interview used in screening and whether one man or a committee is designated to make the selections. It could be equally revealing to learn what kinds of college positions are held by the men who carry on programs of selection.

The data gathered in 1953 and 1958 seem to show some increase in the use of the faculty committee, especially at admission and in periodic review. The committee is still found in only about half of the colleges, however. Table X summarizes the reports from the colleges.

TABLE X

Points at Which Faculty Committees are Used

| | 1953 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|
| Admission to teacher education program | 7 | 10 |
| Periodic review | 7 | 10 |
| Interview of applicant | 3 | 2 |

Who Serves on Committees?

As one examines the composition of the selection committees it is clear that the head of the division of education and the director of student teaching most frequently serve. In many colleges these are the two persons most likely to be most intimately concerned with the program and the students in it. One could at least question whether representatives from academic areas such as the faculty adviser as well as an individual trained in student personnel work might not give strength to the committee in any attempt to look at the appropriateness of the vocational choice of those who want to prepare to teach. Table XI reports the frequency with which different kinds of personnel serve on the selection committee. (Note that multiple responses are expected)

TABLE XI

Personnel Serving on Selection Committees

| | 1953 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|
| No committee employed | 8 | 6 |
| Registrar | 7 | 4 |
| Dean of Liberal Arts | 5 | 3 |
| Director of Student Personnel | 7 | 5 |
| Academic adviser | 3 | 4 |
| Head of Division of Education | 8 | 10 |
| Director of Student Teaching | 6 | 10 |
| Master teacher | 2 | 3 |
| A Teacher in the Student's Major | 5 | 6 |
| Placement officer | 2 | 1 |
| Other | 4 | 4 |

## Use of the Interview

It was mentioned earlier that the interview is used chiefly in this state with students who are experiencing difficulties. However, nearly one-third of the colleges report using it with all students as part of the admission-retention program. The point that is least clear is the manner in which the interview is used. Is it for information-gathering, counseling, orientation, or another purpose? Tables XII, XIII, and XIV merely tell who is interviewed, when, and by whom.

### TABLE XII

Points at Which the Interview is Used

| | Number of colleges reporting 1953 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|
| No interview used | 3 | 1 |
| Only in doubtful cases | 4 | 3 |
| Almost all candidates | 8 | 5 |
| Required before initial admission | 4 | 6 |
| Other | 0 | 2 |

### TABLE XIII

Colleges Reporting Use of Interview for Case Review

| | 1953 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|
| No review of case, usually | 2 | 0 |
| Interview at each review period | 2 | 3 |
| Interview if student is having difficulty | 11 | 12 |
| Interview prior to admission to student teaching | 2 | 6 |
| Other | 2 | 2 |

TABLE XIV

Personnel Interviewing Applicants to Teacher Education

| | 1953 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|
| No interview used | 3 | 1 |
| Trained college counselor | 1 | 2 |
| Counselor in education | 2 | 1 |
| Faculty member in education | 8 | 11 |
| Faculty in field of student's interest | 4 | 4 |
| Head of division of education | 7 | 5 |
| Faculty committee | 3 | 2 |
| Other | 1 | 1 |

Some General Items of Importance

In Part II of this report some of the general questions were raised and some generalizations were drawn from the Preus and Fram analyses of the questionnaires. Their study justifies some further remarks that are somewhat disconnected and unrelated to any specific points that have been discussed. These are given at this point because they may prove worthy of comment at some time during the two-day conference.

On the basis of the practices followed in 1953, Stout divided the colleges into three categories: high selectivity, medium selectivity, and low selectivity. The ratings were made upon the basis of the frequency with which a variety of selective procedures were used on a continuing basis throughout the program. It can be said that Minnesota institutions compare quite favorably with the national picture, since about fifty percent of the Minnesota schools can be placed in the "high selectivity" category. Nationally approximately twenty-five percent fall in the high category. It can be pointed out, however that "high" is a relative term and that even the high-ranking colleges have far to go before they achieve the standards they might set for themselves.

After examining the data one could reach the conclusion that in the past five years there have been more changes in opinion than there have been in practices. However, the following trends can be pointed out:

1. There is some increase in the use of objective tests for the evaluation of academic standards.

2. The greatest increase in the use of selection since 1953 has been at the point of admission to student teaching.

3. Schools more frequently evaluate English proficiency in the process of selection now than in 1953.

4. Although many schools still delay any effective selection until student teaching in the senior year, more colleges are looking upon selection as a continuing program beginning in the sophomore or junior year and continuing through student teaching.

Other facts, disconnected, but worth noting are these:

1. During the years 1952-56 there was a small but steady increase in the number of graduates from the more selective institutions. This was not true for the less selective schools. "Selective" as used here refers to the schools that make relatively more provision for selection, i.e., it refers to the policies and practices rather than to the quality of the product resulting.

2. "Selectivity" as defined in the last paragraph appears to be related to the number of students in the teacher education program. Only one of seven schools with more than 400 in teacher education could be classified "low" but only four of fifteen with fewer than 400 in teacher education could be classified as "high."

3. Schools that admit selectively on the basis of high school rank are more selective in other aspects. Only two of thirteen such schools are classified as "low."

## PART IV

## PROPOSED NEXT STEPS

In this final section, we shall suggest several ideas which may be of help to those who wish to improve selection and retention procedures in Minnesota. These proposals grow out of the work we have done in examining the studies on which this report is based. These may also be points which the workshop participants will wish to discuss in the group meetings. It should be pointed out that many of the ideas suggested below are already found in some colleges in the state, but they do not characterize teacher selection in Minnesota generally.

1. <u>There should be one person on each campus with delegated authority and allotted time to assume major responsibility for coordination of the selection program</u>.

   The person selected for this responsibility should have special training in personnel work.

   He should be able to advise those who make college policy, to establish effective and economical screening procedures, to interpret personnel records including psychological test and interview information, and to assess in a professional manner the students' personal qualifications for teaching.

2. <u>Each college should develop a central records system</u>.

   Records kept in a central place should include transcript, test data, health information, interview notes, reports from instructors and advisers, biographical data, evaluations of student's work in laboratory

experiences including student teaching, and any other information used in the screening process. These records should be readily available to the student personnel coordinator and authorized faculty and staff members. The success of a program of selection and retention is hampered if records are scattered in a number of offices on the campus.

3. Faculty members should be expected to participate in the selection process.

Faculty should be involved in policy-making as well as in carrying out procedures. They should be expected, with appropriate help, to evaluate and interpret the records. Faculty involvement should include individual activities as they advise students and prepare reports about their students for the central file and coordinative activities as they serve on policy and selection committees.

4. A self-study should be undertaken in each college.

A faculty committee might be set up to examine what is being done in selection and retention and to propose modifications of the present program. Self-studies might be furthered if those of us in Minnesota colleges were to visit each other and observe the practices that are most effective on each campus.

5. In the accreditation and review of teacher education institutions greater emphasis should be placed upon adequate programs of selection and retention.

Accrediting teams should include one person with preparation and experience in student personnel work in teacher education.

6. The colleges in Minnesota should undertake a cooperative study of the level of ability of recent graduates who were accepted for teaching positions in Minnesota.

Sponsorship of such a study might come from the State Advisory Committee on Teacher Education and the Minnesota Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards.

7. The colleges in Minnesota should undertake a cooperative study of persistence in teaching as it relates to general ability and other factors.

Such a study would have important implications for the criteria used in selection programs. This type of study could be conducted by an individual college or by a group of colleges. Support of the organizations mentioned in item 6 might again be appropriate.

PART V

## ANNOTATED REFERENCES

Barker, M. Elizabeth. "Summary of the Relation of Personality Adjustment of Teachers to Their Efficiency in Teaching." J. of Educ. Res. 41:664-71. May, 1948.

Personality is studied by case method approach. Concludes that qualities associated with success in teaching are a matter of individuality. Certain adjustments appear to be typically related to teaching efficiency.

Barr, Arvil S., and others. "The Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Efficiency." Rev. of Educ. Res. 25:261-69. June, 1955.

A review of recent research in the area of teacher efficiency, with emphasis upon studies dealing with the characteristics of successful teachers, and measurement of teacher efficiency, pupil evaluation of teachers, and prediction of teaching success. Conclusion is drawn that research is needed to find a pattern that characterizes good teachers.

Barr, Arvil S., and Jones, Robert E. "The Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Efficiency." Rev. of Educ. Res. 28:256-264. June, 1958.

Research tends to concentrate on the particular aspects of teaching efficiency rather than upon the totality. Several studies seem to indicate the MTAI as a useful instrument for measurement and prediction of teacher efficiency. Researchers continue to find low correlations among the more important criteria such as supervisory ratings and pupil growth. A clearer distinction needs to be made between ability and achievement.

Black, Willis J., and Page, M. Jerome. "Recruitment and Selection of Elementary and Secondary School Teachers." Rev. of Educ. Res. 28:198-207. June, 1958.

Summarizes studies on selection, all of which emphasize a continuing trend toward the application of multiple criteria in the selection process, utilizing combinations of instruments and techniques.

Booker, Ted. "Selective Admission to Elementary Education." Peabody J. of Educ. 32:93-98. September, 1954.

Survey based on results gathered from 162 supervisors, teachers, and school administrators. Prerequisites for admission to programs of teacher education listed as follows: high intellectual ability and scholarship plus personality traits, moral character, love of children, sincere desire to teach, physical fitness, scholastic ability, breadth of interests, speech and English usage, emotional maturity and stability.

Bretsch, Howard, and Jacobsen, Gene. "Recruitment, Guidance and Screening Prospective Elementary and Secondary School Teachers." Rev. of Educ. Res. 25:204-212. June, 1955.

A review of the literature. Includes recommendations for recuitment and guidance suggested by the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards.

Bronstein, A. J., and Ogilvie, M. "Importance of the Speech and Voice of Teacher Candidates as Evaluated by Appointing Officers." J. of Educ. Res. 45:715-20. May, 1952.

Concludes that appointing officers consider characteristics of speech and voice in selection of candidates, that recommendations of the teacher education institutions are given careful consideration by most appointing officers. Over one-third of respondents believe that failure to achieve a "satisfactory" level of speech and voice should bar candidates from further consideration.

Burroughs, G. E. R. "Study of the Interview in Selection of Students for Teacher Training." Br. J. of Educ. Res. 28:37-46. February, 1958.

The experiment was designed to make partial inquiry into the possibility that breaking the interview assessment into a number of components might give a better prediction of teaching ability than by total interview assessment. Results indicate three factors operating during interviews: a factor based on observable features of the applicant; one based on judgment of intelligence, maturity, and self-expression; and one based on a number of personality traits. The first two factors gave the best prediction.

Charters, W. W., Jr. "Survival in the Profession: A Criterion for Selecting Teacher Trainees." J. of Teach. Educ. 7:253-255. September, 1956.

Attention on "man-years" of teaching rather than number of graduates. Suggests that by carefully selecting students who will teach a long time, we can prepare fewer teachers.

Cook, W. W., Leeds, C., and Callis, R. Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Manual. New York: Psychological Corporation.

Describes the development, gives directions for the use, and presents normative data for the MTAI.

Craven, Clifford J. "Student Personnel Services in Teacher Education." J. of Teach. Educ. 5:123-28. June, 1954.

Discusses special aspects of student personnel service at State University of New York Teachers College, Oneonta. Lists functions as admission, counseling, selective elimination, extra-curricular program, social program, placement, follow-up.

Edson, William H., and Glotzbach, Charles J. "Recruitment and Selective Admission of Prospective Teachers." Guidance in Teacher Education. Association for Student Teaching, 36th Yearbook. 1957. pp. 21-40.

High standards in selective admission and retention and student self-evaluation should complement each other in an effective teacher education program. Outlines the advantages to be gained from selection, discusses the role of the college staff in selection, and describes different approaches to selection. Emphasis is placed upon continuous selection and the importance of research in developing a sounder base for selection.

Edson, William H., and Wilk, Roger E. An Experimental Study of the Admissions Interview in Teacher Education for Predicting Success in Teaching. Student Personnel Office, College of Education, University of Minnesota. July, 1958.

A study of seven counselors' admission interviews with 167 elementary majors to learn more about the reliability of interview ratings and judgments as these are related to interview content and the kinds of ratings and judgments counselors are asked to make. Counselors are asked for ratings of behavior variables and predictions of the persistence of each student in the teacher education program.

Fulkerson, Glen. "A Resume of Current Teacher Personnel Research." J. of Educ. Res. 47:669-81. May, 1954.

Concludes that there still seems to be no wholly satisfactory plan or system that can be used by those who make judgments about teacher effectiveness. Research has suggested that teaching ability is probably a complex of abilities rather than a unitary trait or behavior pattern.

Fuller, Elizabeth M. "The Use of Teacher-Pupil Attitudes, Self-Rating, and Measures of General Ability in the Pre-Service Selection of Nursery School-Kindergarten-Primary Teachers." J. of Educ. Res. 44:675-686. May, 1951.

Investigates the relation of intellect and self-ratings to student teaching performance. Also uses the MTAI. Concludes that a combination of subjective and objective measures probably producesthe most usable prediction of later teaching performance on the N-K-P level.

Getzels, J. W. "Necessity and Innovation in the Selection and Training of Teachers." Elem. Sch. J. 55:427-434. April, 1955.

Emphasizes that there has not been a complete investigation concerned with prediction of teaching efficiency to the time of this article's publication. The difficulty of research lies with the matter of criteria.

Goodenough, F. L., Fuller, E. M., and Olson, Edna. "The Use of the Goodenough Speed of Association Test in the Pre-Service Selection of Nursery School-Kindergarten-Primary Teachers." J. of Educ. Psych. 40:335-346. September, 1946.

Conclusion is that the association test holds possibilities for pre-service selection of teachers but more adequate study is needed. Provides evidence

to encourage high-scoring persons but not enough evidence to discourage others.

Gould, George. "The Predictive Value of Certain Selective Measures." Educ. Adm. and Sup. 33:208-12. April, 1947.

Studies eight factors in their relationship to a principal's rating of teachers' success. A personal interview and student teaching rating are found to have most value.

Grim, Paul R., and Hoyt, Cyril J. "Appraisal of Teaching Competency." Ed. Res. Bul. 31:85-91. April, 1952.

Mentions three approaches used for improving quality of professional personnel: effective selection, functional pre-service education, and in-service education. Purpose of the paper is to attempt to define and evaluate certain aspects of teaching competency to serve needs of the three approaches. Two instruments developed for this purpose.

LaBue, Anthony. "A Study of Motivation of Persistent and Non-Persistent Students in Teacher Education." J. of Teach. Educ. 5:242-243. September, 1954.

Reports the reasons for teaching given by persistent and non-persistent persons. Differences between the two groups are reported.

Lawson, Douglas. "A Study of Selective Admission Based Upon Character Evaluation as Practiced in Teacher Training Institutions Throughout the United States." Ed. Adm. and Sup. 35:421-26. November, 1949.

Of 237 institutions returning a questionnaire, only 42 used what appears to be some plan of systematic screening in an effort to disqualify candidates of undesirable character. The interview is the technique used chiefly. Less than three percent useda standardized test in 1949.

MacLean, Malcolm, Gowan, May, and Gowan, John. "A Teacher Selection and Counseling Service." J. of Educ. Res. 48:669-77. May, 1955.

Article emphasizes need for selection program to increase quality of teachers, and to encourage superior students to teach. Outlines the prerequisites to a sound selection program. Describes program at the University of California.

Major, C. L. "Influence of Academic Standing Upon Success in Student Teaching." Educ. Res. Bul. 32:66-67. March, 1953.

Academic rating above a certain critical point is not significant to such a degree that it can be used as a criterion for forecasting teaching success, according to this article.

Mitzel, Harold E., and Gross, Cecily G. A Critical Review of the Development of Pupil Growth Criteria in Studies of Teacher Effectiveness. Div. of Teacher Education, Board of Higher Education, City of New York. April, 1956.

One of a series of continuing research reports (35 to date) dealing with the many specific questions in the general area of teacher selection and evaluation. This report is a review of the published research in which measures of pupil growth have been developed as criteria of effective teaching. Attention here is particularly upon pupil achievement as a criterion.

Ohlsen, Merle M., and Schultz, Raymond E. "A Study of Variables for Use in Selection." J. of Teach. Educ. 5:279-282. December, 1954.

A study of the traits associated with the best student teachers and poorest student teachers as these were selected by the head supervisor at the University of Illinois. Traits are enumerated in the article. Selective instruments such as the Thematic Apperception Test, Strong Vocational Interest Blank, Life Values Test (and others) were used along with supervisor judgments. The relationship of the test scores to membership in the good and poor groups is given. All but the SVIB showed some promise.

Page, Martha Hessel, and Travers, Robert. "Relationship Between Rorschach Performance and Student Teaching." J. of Educ. Psych. 44:31-40. 1953.

The study concludes that personality characteristics are subordinated to situational factors such as age of pupils, amount of time spent with them, intelligence, and level of work.

Rocchio, Patrick, and Kearney, Nolan C. "Using an Attitude Inventory in Selecting Teachers." Elem. Sch. J. 56:76-78. October, 1955.

A study of the validity of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory.

Ryans, David G., and Wandt, E. "A Factor Analysis of Observed Teacher Behaviors in Secondary School: A Study of Criterion Data." Educ. and Psych. Meas. 12:4:574-586. Winter, 1952.

One of several reports from a continuing project sponsored by the American Council on Education to study teacher characteristics through a factor analysis approach. In this article the authors list the factors associated with good teaching at the secondary level.

Shaw, Jack. "Student Personnel Work in Teacher Education." Teacher Education for a Free People. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Oneonta, New York. 1956. pp. 312-359.

A comprehensive statement of the role of student personnel work in teacher education. Basic reading for anyone who seeks a thorough and thoughtful statement on this aspect of teacher preparation in its relationship to the total program.

Stout, Ruth, "Selective Admissions and Retention Practices in Teacher Education." J. of Tech. Educ. 8:299-317. September, 1957.

The first part of a resume of a national study of the status of teacher recruitment and selection in 1953. This is the most thorough survey done on this topic to date. This article together with others growing out of the same survey are basic reading for anyone who would be familiar with the practices and the opinions associated with teacher selection.

Stout, Ruth. "Selective Admissions and Retention Practices in Teacher Education." J. of Tech. Educ. 8:422-432. December, 1957.

A further report of the national survey conducted by Dr. Stout.

Stout, Ruth. "Admission and Retention Practices in College Programs of Teacher Education." Personnel and Guidance J. 34:208-212. December, 1955.

A report based upon Stout's national survey listing the criteria believed by respondents to be most important in teacher selection. Indicates the differences found between beliefs and practices.

Upshall, C. C. "The Validity of Composite Faculty Judgment as a Method of Identifying Undesirable Prospective Elementary School Teachers." J. of Educ. Res. 35:694-699. May, 1942.

The study supports the use of faculty judgments as a basis for identifying least desirable teachers. Those named by the faculty had lower academic ability (tested) and achievement (grades), lower student teaching grades, more difficulty in finding jobs, but were not different in whether or not they graduated from the program.

The following articles may be of interest to those who wish to read a description of a program of selection and retention as it is carried on in practice. These are chiefly descriptive reports of the characteristics of existing programs.

Andrews, L. O. "Admission and Selective Retention in a University College of Education." Teacher Education: The Decade Ahead. DeKalb Conference Report. Washington, D. C.: N. E. A. 1955. pp. 252-258.

Clarke, Stanley C. T. "Teacher Candidate Selection at California State Polytechnic College." J. of Educ. Res. 43:270 ff. December, 1949.

Grim, Paul R., and Edson, William H. "Continuous Selection in a Program of Professional Laboratory Experiences." Education. 72:325-331. January, 1952.

Magee, R. M. "Selection of Candidates for Teacher Education." J. of Teach. Educ. 3:168-172. September, 1952.

Mosier, E. E. "Student Personnel Services in Teacher Education at Michigan State Normal College." Teacher Education: The Decade Ahead. DeKalb Conference Report. Washington, D. C.: N. E. A. 1955. pp. 270-277.

Stripling, Robert A., and Horton, Thomas R. "Selective Admission to Teacher Education." J. of Teach. Educ. 5:74-78. March, 1954.

White, V. "Selection of Prospective Teachers at Syracuse University." J. of Teach. Educ. 1:24-31. March, 1950.